

Amendments to the drawings:

Attached hereto is a substitute drawing sheet containing amended Fig. 1 and new Fig. 2.

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a simultaneously filed Request for Continued Examination and in response to the final rejection dated March 17, 2006, which set a three-month period for response. Filed herewith is a Request for a One-month Extension of Time, making a response due by July 17, 2006.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

In the final Office Action, the drawings were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 06-227801 to Tanizaki et al. Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 63-049249 to Yoshioka et al. Claims 1-11 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 63-289775 to Kamoshita et al.

In the present amendment, Fig. 1 has been amended to address the noted objections. In addition, new Fig. 2 has been added, which illustrates the features listed by the Examiner has not shown by the drawings. The Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 2 does not constitute new matter, since all of the features shown in Fig. 2 were described and/or claimed in the application as originally filed.

To more clearly define the present invention over the cited references, claim 1 has been amended to add the feature that the apparatus includes a second heating element (9) that is flowed-through by the heating stream for


heating at least one of the first or second converters, wherein the second heating element is provided an outlet opening and with a flap for closing the outlet opening.

None of the cited documents shows a device for converting a flow of matter containing hydrocarbons with two heating elements, where one of these heating elements can be switched off by a flap at its outlet opening. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited references. A prior art reference anticipates a claim only if the reference discloses every limitation of the claim. Absence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. *Row v. Dror*, 42 USPQ 2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further request reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700